

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The foregoing amendment and the following arguments are provided to impart precision to the claims, by more particularly pointing out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art.

35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 11, 17, 18, 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 11, 17, 18 and 20 were all dependent on cancelled claims. The claims have been amended to correct this deficiency and overcome the rejection.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9, 11-13, 15 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,938,770 (hereinafter "Kim").

Claim 1, as amended, includes a limitation of wherein a second stage transforms a second output. Kim does not teach such a limitation, and as a result, claim 1 is not anticipated by Kim. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the power switch 64 of Figure 5 of Kim is equivalent to the second stage of claim 1. However, the power switch merely switches the power output from the power supply 16 to one of the three hub ports DP1, DP2, and DP3 (Col. 5, lines 9-13). In other words, the power switch receives a power output from the power supply, the controller 62 supplies the power switch with a power switching control signal, and the power switch directs the power output, *as received*, to the hub port designated by the controller (Col. 5, lines 6-9).

Further, the power switch is composed of a multiplexer and a microcomputer, neither of
Appl. No. 09/656,504
Amdt. dated January 28, 2004
Reply to Office action of October 28, 2003

which inherently has the ability to transform the input. As a result, the power switch merely *directs* the output of the power supply to the proper hub port, and does not transform the second output as in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Kim.

Claim 9, as amended, includes a limitation of wherein a second circuit transforms a second output. Kim does not teach such a limitation, and as a result, claim 9 is not anticipated by Kim. Instead, as mentioned above, Kim teaches a power switch that merely directs an output from a power supply to a designated hub port. Therefore, Kim does not teach where a second circuit transforms a second output, as in claim 9. As a result, claim 9 is not anticipated by Kim.

Claim 15, as amended, includes a limitation of wherein a secondary circuit transforms a second output. As mentioned above, the power switch taught by Kim merely directs the power output of a power supply to an appropriate hub port. As a result, claim 15 is not anticipated by Kim.

Independent claims 1, 9, and 15 include a limitation of a second output which is different from the first output. Kim does not teach such a limitation. Specifically, as can be seen in Figure 14, the Hub Ports DP1, DP2, and DP3 are powered by the voltage 'V' (see the line between switch 94 and hub port DP1). It follows that these same hub ports as shown in Figure 5 are also powered by V. Therefore, the first output V, and the second output (the line between the power supply 16 and the power switch 64) are supplying the same output, since V is required for the hub ports. As a result, claims 1, 9, and 15 are not anticipated by Kim.

Claims 2, 5-7, 11-13, and 17-19 depend from the above discussed independent claims, and therefore include all the limitations of those independent claims. As a

result, since the independent claims are not anticipated by Kim, claims 2, 5-7, 11-13, and 17-19 are also not anticipated by Kim.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, 8, 14, and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,938,770 (hereinafter "Kim").

Claim 8 includes a limitation of wherein a second stage comprises a portion of a forward converter. Neither Kim nor the well known art teach such a limitation, and therefore Claim 8 is patentable over Kim. The Examiner asserts that this limitation is obvious in light of the fact that forward converters are well known in the art. However, it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to substitute a forward converter in place of a power switch, as would be the result if the known art were combined with Kim. As mentioned above, the power switch taught by Kim does not alter the output provided by the power supply, as a forward converter would. As a result, there is no suggestion to combine Kim with the known art. For this reason, it would not be obvious to combine a forward converter with Kim, and claim 8 is patentable over Kim.

Claim 14 includes a limitation of wherein a second circuit comprises a final stage of a forward converter. As mentioned above with respect to claim 8, there is no suggestion to combine a forward converter with Kim. Therefore, claim 14 is patentable over Kim.

Claim 20 includes a limitation of wherein a secondary circuit comprises a portion of a forward converter. As mentioned above with respect to claim 8, there is no suggestion to combine a forward converter with Kim. Therefore, claim 20 is patentable over Kim.

Claims 3, 4, 21, and 22 depend from the above mentioned independent claims, and therefore include all the limitations of those independent claims. As a result, since the independent claims are not anticipated by Kim, claims 3, 4, 21, and 22 are patentable over Kim.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Arlen M. Hartounian at (408) 720-8300.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 1/28/04



Arlen M. Hartounian
Reg. No. 52,997

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(408) 720-8300